-----Original Message-----
From: Stacie LaFaive [mailto:SLafaive@provcorp.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 04, 2010 2:10 PM
To: ldear@valleycities.org
Cc: Pauline Freund; Stephanie Arthur; Heather Hefner
Subject: DV CCR Meeting Suggestion/Problem

Hi Lora,

I just got off the phone with Doug Bartholomew up in Bellevue. In the past he has talked with Heather, fairly certain her past phone calls with him have been similar in nature.

He basically laid into me and stated the Federal Way Court is the only court in WA to require a DV defendant to complete an assessment. That per the WAC all DV cases are automatically to be placed into the DV program and that it would be considered, how did he put it....., profiling? if he were to do an assessment. Then he went on to compare doing an assessment to when Native Americans and African Americans were segregated?? Not sure how this was relevant.

He then went on to threaten that he was getting some sort of task force together to go after the courts who require an assessment- as they are illegal and should not be done. Also implying that both our Court and Prosecutors were involved in requiring something that is illegal.

In the past we have had a few clients go to him for their assessment and he refused to do one, just automatically started them into the DV program. Which then became an issue for us, due to needing an assessment to determine whether or not any other programs were needed or not- or whether this was even addressed. Today's conversation ended with Mr. Bartholomew wanting to know whether or not a client would get sent back to court if he put them straight into his program (again as doing an assessment would be illegal). I advised him that it would be best to write this information into a letter and provide it with the defendants enrollment information.

I have thoroughly gone through the WAC and have spoken to several other Treatment agencies and we all concur that no where in the WAC does it require a DV defendant to automatically be enrolled into a DV perpetrator program.

Now that you are the DV CCR Chairperson, I was wondering if this is something that could be added to next month's meeting to discuss? I am pretty sure that we have discussed it in the past as the wording on our court order state "evaluation" when technically it should state "assessment" as there is a difference between the two, but I cannot remember if we discussed this specific matter. I was actually unaware that it was such a big issue with this particular treatment provider and I am curious as to whether or not this is a common difference between treatment agencies.

I do not appreciate being called and essentially yelled at by a treatment provider. I was caught off guard today by his phone call, but I would like the committee to look into the matter so that next time I can have more information available regarding the matter.

Is this something that can be added to the next meeting?

Thank you.

Stacie LaFaive
Project Supervisor
Providence Community Corrections
Federal Way, WA
(253) 838-2333 phone
(253) 661-8498 fax

From: Doug Bartholomew [mailto:doug@doug-bartholomew.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 11, 2010 10:15 AM
To: Pooley, Annette
Subject: RE:

Unfortunately, not enough deaths because Sno Co just announced it will send all DV cases to one day anger management classes and victim impact panel. There will be lots more deaths, beause (since most of my work is cleanup) I see lots of people who went through AM/VIP and they all say the same thing.

Of the victim panels they all say "wow, Domestic violence is a terrible thing! I'm sure glad I wasn't as bad as all those other guys."

Of AM they all sa "Wow, now that I know what abuse is, I've learned how much my wife abuses me and that SHE is the real abuser in this case!"

So there will be lots more reoffenses and perhaps even deaths.

In Pierce County, Maple Valley, Federal Way, Snohomish County, whategver county Ellensburg is in, Spokane county, and many more the judges and prosecutors, in order to get more people to stipulate, don't make them stipulate to the plea, the evidence or the charge, only make them stipulate to an evaluation to see if they "need treatment", so some half starved registered counselor with no training in forensics has to decide if the crime occured with no finding of fact.

More recently bothell, kirkland, and even sometimes in seattle and a lot in Bellevue, they are stipulating to "evaluation to see if they need treatment" with no hammer and no finding of fact.

This has done several things. It shifts the blame from the court to the counselor for the client being in treatment, which is what has led to the severe abuse treatment providers are getting from men's group, even the legitimate ones, and the bad ones, such as wadvpress.com saying how can therpists force people into treatment when there is no evidence of a crime.

This dilemma has not only resulted in lots and lots of offenders going free just because the judge or prosecutor is lazy or wants to save money, and has put treatment providers in an inevetable double bind.

Because, without a finding of fact, you can't justify putting someone in treatmet.

And since the research shows definitively that there is no way to predict future offenses and 66% reoffend within the first year and most of the rest within five years, there is no clinical way to prove that someone *doesn't* need treatment.

In the Colorado model, which is currently being considered here, there are no evaluations to see if someone needs treatment, and they can't be referred for anything until there is a finding of fact, with a good hammer for non-compliance. Then the evaluation is not whether or not they need treatment because everyone gets the state basic treatment just because they did the crime. But whether they need somethiung more, like a more intensive program oriented toward criminals, or one oriented toward sex offenders, or one oriented toward substance abusers. Or just a longer program.

So if we implemented the two laws I suggested it would go a long way toward saving lives and preventing further abuse by saying you do the crime, you do the time and with a hammer like a stipulation to the charge, non-compliance can be delt with severely and quickly.

Now, here's the rub. Since there hasn't been any sort of quality control for 20 years all the business has gone to the lowest bidder with the lowest quality and many good people have retired or left the field and few it any new people really qualified to do good work are coming in. Thus, once we have Gold STandards in KC we won't have enough qualified people to do that kind of work. So I have a very small, tentative conspiracy going on the side to see if we can train up enough people to do the work once it becomes law.

More later; gottas go. I'll keep you posted.

Doug Bartholomew MS, LMHC
1750 112th Ave. NE # B-218
Bellevue, WA 98004
Phone: 425-635-0188
email doug@doug-bartholomew.comcastbiz.net
FAX 425-451-8184
website www.doug-bartholomew.com

Addendum to original Document-

Employee Detail

Name: **Annette Pooley**

Title: Probation Officer

Group: KCDC/PSD - Issaquah Probation Office

Mail Stop: ISS-DC-0100

Primary Phone: 206-205-1736

Fax: 206-205-1729

Reports To: Judy Garcia

Primary Location: Issaquah District Court
5415 220th Avenue SE
Issaquah, WA 98029

Directory Coordinators: Anita Pioli

Web Link: http://www.kingcounty.gov/courts/districtcourt

From: Martin, David

Sent: Wednesday, December 02, 2009 10:51 PM

To: Doug Bartholomew

Subject: RE: Gary Ruffcorn

Gary is the poster child for sentencing reform. Unfortunately, I dealt with this son as well (also with a troubling history of DV) before his passing. With each of them law enforcement had serious safety concerns (not surprising given how Gary's son passed). I would not spend too much time contemplating Gary. We can help make people safer, we dont make them safe.

I know there are many areas of agreement in how to move forward in DV. Its not easy but I appreciate you sharing your thoughts and ideas. I dont have all or even some of the answers, but I feel as though things have changed. I guess we will see what the legislative session brings.

David D. Martin

Senior Deputy Prosecuting Attorney

Chair, Domestic Violence Unit

(w) 206-296-9503

(c) 206-898-9416

-----Original Message-----

From: Doug Bartholomew [mailto:doug@doug-bartholomew.com]

Sent: Wed 12/2/2009 10:38 PM

To: Martin, David

Subject: Gary Ruffcorn

Well, crow is a meal best eaten cold. And karma is a ...

I was looking something up this evening and stumbled upon your article about tougher sentencing guidelines. I would like to say I have an excuse for what Gary did. The pictures were horrible. He was one of mine in 2006. He did what he was supposed to do and I truely believe he was sincere. I don't know what I would have done differently. He was an old dog. But it still is a failure, and one in which someone got horribly hurt.

At the same time as he was in group I had a cop in the group which met right before his. One day the early group was late and Gary was already in the waiting room. The cop took one look at Gary and came back into the therapy room and said "you're in over your head, and I want to be on a different night because I don't even want to be in the same building as him."

I'm going to be doing a lot of soul searching on this one.

On a happier note the meetings that are going on are the most exciting I've seen since the WAC's were passed in 1992. You are giving me hope! We have a chance here to make history and prove that if we all work together asnd we all take responsibilty for our role in stopping violence (and keep good statistics) we can show the world that it can be done right and it is worth still trying. Thank you.

Doug Bartholomew MS, LMHC

1750 112th Ave. NE # B-218

Bellevue, WA 98004

Phone: 425-635-0188

email doug@doug-bartholomew.comcastbiz.net

FAX 425-451-8184

website www.doug-bartholomew.com